

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Initially, it is noted that Applicants have not yet received Examiner initialed copies of the Information Disclosure Statements previously submitted to the USPTO on September 18, 2007 and October 21, 2009. Accordingly, the Examiner is kindly requested to furnish such Examiner initialed copies to the Applicants.

Next, it is noted that claims 1-4 and 6 as presented in the Amendment dated January 26, 2010 are pending in the present application.

The Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by Supervisory Examiner Thai Tran for conducting a personal interview with the Applicants' representative at the United States Patent and Trademark Office on September 15, 2010. As reflected on the Interview Summary (PTOL-413), agreement was reached that the Murase et al. reference does not disclose the last limitation appearing in claim 1. Included next is a Substance of the Interview.

Claims 1-4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Murase et al. (USPN: 5,907,658) for the reasons contained in paragraph 5 of the Office action.

During the personal interview, the Applicants' representative traversed the aforementioned rejection on the basis that the Murase reference fails to teach each and every feature recited in independent claim 1 for the same reasons as contained in the Remarks section of the Amendment previously submitted on January 26, 2010, such remarks being incorporated by reference herein.

In summary, the Examiner has relied upon the description of column 25 (lines 7-31) and Figs. 19-20 of the Murase reference for teaching the feature of each Display Set including version information that shows whether or not content of each of the pages in the Display Set has changed with respect to a previous Display Set. However, assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner's interpretations of the Murase reference are correct, then it would also be necessary for the Murase reference to disclose information indicating, for each video object unit, how the item information and highlight information that define the menu in Figure 19A changes with respect to the item information and highlight information that define the menu in Figure 19B. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the Murase reference clearly does not provide such a teaching for at least the reasons provided next.

Particularly, the Murase reference discloses that a value stored in a general purpose register changes according to a confirmed selection on menus displayed by a sub-picture pack in each video object unit. Viewing Figure 20, when a selection is confirmed using "Yes" item (i.e., when "Yes" is selected twice) in a menu of the sub-picture pack A-101 in the 101th VOB and in a menu of the sub-picture pack A-125 in the 125th VOB, because the register command "SetReg R1, 1" is executed twice, the value stored in the general purpose register is "2" [see column 25 (lines 7-10)]. Next, suppose that the reproduction of a series of images as shown in Fig. 18 is completed after these substitutions of the general purpose register and the reproduction control changes from the GOP level shown in Figs. 19A and 19B to the route level with the PGC information shown in Fig. 17. As a result, because the value stored in the general purpose register R1 is "2", the command "CmpRegLink R1, 2, =, PGC#5" in the post-processing command field is executed and the disk reproduction apparatus judges that general-purpose

register R1 has “2” and the reproduction control branches to program chain #5 because the value stored in the general purpose register matches “2” [see column 25 (lines 10-18)].

Accordingly, while column 25 (lines 7-31) of the Murase reference discloses a general purpose register having a value which changes according to a selection confirmed on menus of two video objects, such portion of the Murase reference does not disclose information indicating, for each video object unit, how the item information and highlight information that define the menu in Figure 19A changes with respect to the item information and highlight information that define the menu in Figure 19B. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Murase reference does not disclose version information that shows whether or not content of each of the pages in the Display Set has changed with respect to a previous Display set, as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that independent claim 1, as well as claims 2-4 and 6 dependent therefrom, are clearly allowable and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass this case to issuance.

In the event, however, that the Examiner has any comments or suggestion of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicant's representatives to expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dhiren Odedra, Reg. #41,227/

September 28, 2010

Dhiren Odedra
Reg. No. 41,227

Panasonic Patent Center
1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: 202-912-3800
Fax: 202-912-0774

Customer No. 42212